



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/587,890 | 07/31/2006 | Feng Lin | | 2354 |

7590 11/25/2008
Lin Feng
Blk 110, #12-120
Woodlands Street 13
Singapore, 730110
SINGAPORE

EXAMINER

CHACKO, SUNIL

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

4146

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

11/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/587,890 | Applicant(s) LIN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner SUNIL CHACKO | Art Unit 4146 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/31/2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5 are presented for examination
2. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

Abstract Objection

3. The Abstract is objected to because it does not follow the format set out in the MPEP Chapter 608.01 (b). *The sheet presenting the abstract may not include other parts of the application or other material.* Please make appropriate corrections.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

4. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. See

Art Unit: 4146

Pages 7-10 in applicant's specifications: Page 7 lines 33-34, Page lines 11-13, Page 9 lines 8, 13-14, 16 & 32-33, & Page 10 lines 4-5, 7-8, & 27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 1 is rejected due to indefiniteness. The following claims are expressed as a *means for* performing a specified function, and no corresponding structure, material or acts described in the specifications. Please see MPEP 112 paragraph 2 & 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 4146

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 1-5 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motegi (Patent # 6,307,640) in view of (Rothfus et al (Patent # 6,044,372)

As to Claim 1:

Motegi discloses the following limitations as shown:

A network printer system that connects to the network, including: a keypad and a printer;

- **means for the user inputting a number in said keypad;** Motegi teaches a network printer system which allows a user to select a printer by entering on a keypad the print job number, See column 2 lines 60-64.

Motegi remains silent on the following limitations:

Art Unit: 4146

- **means for** sending said number, over the Internet, to a remote server, which translates said number into the information of receiving the document on the Internet and sends said information to said printer system;
- **means for** receiving said information, and according to said received information, receiving the document over the Internet;
- and means for printing said received document in said printer.

However Rothfus et al teaches an apparatus that is able to publish data through a communications network, Rothfus also teaches his apparatus provides output interface and output system that enables the apparatus the capacity to be able to print documents across the internet. **It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine** this aspect of Rothfus et al apparatus to Motegi System, because it would create a secure and straightforward method to communicate via the internet. Rothfus et al teaches in Column 11 lines 15-21 that his systems posses a output interface and output system which directs documents to resources such as printers, See Fig 3 Block 76 77. Motegi teaches a system that in which a print job number is inputted into a keypad, See column 2 lines 60-64. This information is then sent to the printer server which matches it with appropriate printer and computer, See column 3 lines 15-19. Motegi also teaches that a printer which prints the data sent through the network,

Art Unit: 4146

See Fig 1. Combining Motegi, in View of Rothfus would ensure that the above listed limitations would all be met.

As to Claim 2:

Motegi in view of Rothfus et al. discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 2.

A network printer system of claim 1

- *is a network printer.* Motegi teaches a network printer in the network printer system, See Column 2 lines 23-24 and Fig 1.

As to Claim 3:

Motegi discloses the following limitations as shown:

In the network printing system that includes a keypad, a printer and a server, a method for printing the document in the printer using the keypad includes:

- *the user, in the keypad of said printing system, inputs a number; said number is sent to the server of said network printing system ;* Motegi teaches a network printer system which allows a user to select a printer by entering on a keypad the print job number, See column 2 lines 60-64. Motegi also teaches the use of

Art Unit: 4146

two servers through which all data and travels to and from the server, See Fig 1
Block 105 and 106 and Column 2 lines 43-48.

Motegi remains silent on the following limitations:

- *said server sends said number, over the Internet, to a remote server, which translates said number into the information of retrieving the document on the Internet and sends said information to said server;*
- *said server receives said information, and according to said received information, retrieves said document over the Internet;*
- *and said server prints said retrieved document at the printer of said network printing system.*

However Rothfus et al teaches an apparatus that is able to publish data through a communications network, Rothfus also teaches his apparatus provides output interface and output system that enables the apparatus the capacity to be able to print documents across the internet. **It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine** this aspect of Rothfus et al apparatus to Motegi System, because it would create a secure and straightforward method to communicate via the internet. Rothfus et al teaches in Column 11 lines 15-21 that his systems posses a output interface and output system which directs documents to resources such as printers, See

Art Unit: 4146

Fig 3 Block 76 77. Motegi teaches a system that in which a print job number is inputted into a keypad, See column 2 lines 60-64. This information is then sent to the printer server which matches it with appropriate printer and computer, See column 3 lines 15-19. Motegi also teaches that a printer which prints the data sent through the network, See Fig 1. Motegi also teaches the use of two servers through which all data travels to and from the server, See Fig 1 Block 105 and 106 and column 2 lines 43-48.

Combining Motegi, in View of Rothfus would ensure that the above listed limitations would all be met.

As to Claim 4:

Motegi in view of Rothfus et al. discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 3.

The method according to claim 3, said network printing system further includes a plurality of keypads and a plurality of printers;

- *and said server determines, according to said keypad in which said number is entered, an appropriate destination printer among said plurality of printers, and prints said retrieved document at said appropriate printer.* Motegi teaches a network printer system which allows a user to select a printer by entering on a keypad the print job number, See column 2 lines 60-64. Motegi teaches that each printer has a keypad, and that there are numerous printers, See Fig 1 block

Art Unit: 4146

107-110.

As to Claim 5:

Motegi in view of Rothfus et al. discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 3.

The method according to claim 3,

Motegi remains silent on the following limitations:

- *said received information includes the URL of the document.*

However Rothfus et al teaches an apparatus that is able to publish data through a communications network, Rothfus also teaches his method provides output interface and output system that enables the apparatus the capacity to be able to print documents across the internet. **It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine** this aspect of Rothfus et al method to Motegi method, because it would create a secure and straightforward method to communicate via the internet. Rothfus et al teaches in Column 6 lines 13-22 the use of URL to locate files and documents by the network. Combining Motegi, in View of Rothfus would ensure that the above listed limitations would all be met.

Art Unit: 4146

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure US Patent # 4, 843, 571, which deals with printing over a network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUNIL CHACKO whose telephone number is (571)270-7221. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 to 5 Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ramesh Patel can be reached on 571-272-3688. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SUNIL CHACKO
Examiner
Art Unit 4146

/Ramesh B. Patel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4146